



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

*[Handwritten signature]*

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/800,646	03/06/2001	Ranjan Prasad	50325-0508	3341

29989 7590 04/05/2004

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER, LLP  
1600 WILLOW STREET  
SAN JOSÉ, CA 95125

EXAMINER

AGDEPPA, HECTOR A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2642	<i>[Handwritten signature]</i>

DATE MAILED: 04/05/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/800,646	PRASAD ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Hector A. Agdeppa	2642	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 March 2001.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 06 March 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

1. Claims 9 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Line 4 of claim 9 and line 3 of claim 14 recite the limitation "request to from." For purposes of examination, Examiner will assume that the limitation is meant to read "request from." However, appropriate correction or explanation (if Examiner's assumption is inconsistent with Applicant's intent) is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation

under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

2. Claims 1 – 4, 9 – 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 6,031,904 (An et al.)

As to claims 1 and 13, An et al. teaches a means and method for modifying a subscriber's feature profile, wherein when a subscriber desires access to/modify his/her profile, they are first validated via, for example, their directory number and PIN. Upon positive verification, the subscriber is presented with all the features/services they currently subscribe to. Note that the feature profiles are stored locally either on server 50, machine 52, as well as in profile repository 18. An et al. teaches that a subscriber may modify their profile and the locally stored profile reflects such a change, read is the first service information, and later, this information is sent to the profile repository 18 to commit the change, and the new profile is stored as the subscriber's current profile, read as the claimed second service information. It is inherent that some means for executing the modification is used, even if such means is included in the "committing" of the change in profile repository 18. The modification would have no purpose unless it was actually executed. (Fig. 2, Col. 4, line 17 – Col. 5, line 34, Col. 5, line 49 – Col. 9, line 30)

.Art Unit: 2642

What An et al. does not teach is the use of a privilege token, but tokens are very old and well known in the art as merely one means of effecting validation. A token can be any piece/bit of information/data used to compare data such as the aforementioned directory number and PIN with. Even in networking, as a term of art, a token is merely a set of bits that if the network recognizes, allows the data tagged with that token access to transmit/travel over the network.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have used a privilege token method of validation inasmuch as again, it is merely one of a plurality of well known methods of validation. Moreover, it would not affect the operation or teach away from the service provisioning aspect of An et al. inasmuch as the validation process is a separate one from the provisioning process.

As to claim 2, An et al. does not teach mapping a user name to a distinguished name. Instead An et al. as discussed above, uses a user's directory number and PIN to identify that user. However, mapping names or other identifiers is also old and well known in the art and would merely be a design choice or preference for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made. Such a feature again, would not affect the provisioning aspect of the invention. Note that An et al. does teach using a DN name mapper 134 (Fig. 13) for properly associating a subscriber with the correct service manager and specific address. (Col. 7, lines 33 – 48)

Also, a subscriber in An et al. may have more than one line, i.e., a landline, a wireless subscription, pager service, local and/or long distance service, etc., read as the claimed roles.

. Art Unit: 2642

As to claims 3 and 4, such limitations merely address the programming level aspect of the invention, i.e., object-oriented languages that would implement the profile and validation aspects of the present invention. While An et al. describes the validation on a much higher level, such would also be obvious if not inherent in An et al. inasmuch as most of the programming languages or protocols used in tele/data communications in recent years have been object-oriented and are necessary to effect the operation in computer-based systems.

As to claim 9, see the above rejection of claim 1 and note that An et al. also teaches that besides merely displaying a subscriber's current feature profile to them, the subscriber is actually "logged in" as they are able to amend each feature on their current profile. (Figs. 5 – 12 and Col. 5, lines 35 – 48)

As to claim 10, see the rejection of claims 2 – 4 above, and note that the same is applicable as well to the actual service features inasmuch as An et al. teaches that each feature that a subscriber may subscribe to, may have parameters. An et al. also teaches that a subscriber may read about his services, or others that are available to him/her, as well as being able to get descriptions regarding the cost of services, or example. (Figs. 5 – 12 and Col. 6, line 39 – Col. 9, line 20)

As to claim 11, An et al. teaches the use of a subscriber service provisioning manager (SSPM) server 122 which includes an authentication server 136, the abovementioned DN name mapper, and a service manager adaptor 138. Such a server is read as the claimed selection gateway.

As to claims 12 and 14, see the rejection of claims 1 and 2.

Art Unit: 2642

As to claim 15, see Col. 5, lines 6 – 48 and Figs. 5 – 6, wherein An et al. teaches that personalized web pages are displayed to a subscriber with only those features that they are presently subscribed to as well as those that they may subscribe to.

As to claims 16 - 18, see the rejection of claim 1.

3. Claims 5 – 8 and 19 – 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 6,031,904 (An et al.) in view of US 6,622,016 (Sladek et al.)

As to claims 5 and 19 – 22, An et al. has been discussed above. What An et al. does not teach are group subscriptions.

However, provisioning group preferences and profiles is old and well known as is group subscriptions, or subscribers who share the same preferences. Common examples of this are business groups within a corporation or family groups, etc. Such is taught by Sladek et al. wherein a system for controlled provisioning of telecommunications services is also applicable to a group of subscribers. (Abstract, Col. 2, lines 36 – 46, Col. 3, lines 8 - 21, Col. 17, lines 16 – 28 of Sladek et al.)

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have allowed for groups inasmuch as they are old and well known and would only affect the relational aspect of subscribers. Instead of providing service to one subscriber, it would be to a group of subscribers, linked in some manner in the profile repository 18 of An et al.

Moreover, it is inherent that some administrator or head affect changes for the group and of course, as discussed above, would have to be validated as well. Even if

Art Unit: 2642

all the members of a group could make changes to the group subscription, each of the members then could be considered administrators, because to be an administrator, one need only have the ability to administrate, in this example, over service features.

As to claim 6, see the rejection of claim 2 and note that such would be inherent or at the least, obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made. A group would merely be considered to be another subscriber, except, as discussed above, there would be some manner of linking the group members so that the feature profile for the group would affect all the members.

As to claims 7 and 8, see the rejection of claims 3 and 4.

### ***Conclusion***

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hector A. Agdeppa whose telephone number is 703-305-1844. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon thru Fri 9:30am - 6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ahmad F. Matar can be reached on 703-305-4731. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2642

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

H.A.A.  
March 23, 2004

  
AHMAD MATAR  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600